

An Information-Theoretic Analysis of Deduplication

Urs Niesen

Abstract

Deduplication finds and removes long-range data duplicates. It is commonly used in cloud and enterprise server settings and has been successfully applied to primary, backup, and archival storage. Despite its practical importance as a source-coding technique, its analysis from the point of view of information theory is missing. This paper provides such an information-theoretic analysis of data deduplication. It introduces a new source model adapted to the deduplication setting. It formalizes both fixed and variable-length deduplication schemes, and it introduces a novel, multi-chunk deduplication scheme. It then provides an analysis of these three deduplication variants, emphasizing the importance of boundary synchronization between source blocks and deduplication chunks. In particular, under fairly mild assumptions, the proposed multi-chunk deduplication scheme is shown to be order optimal.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation

Data deduplication is a commonly used technique to reduce storage requirements in data centers and enterprise servers. It operates by identifying and removing duplicate blocks of data over long ranges. For example, consider a corporate logo used in many slide decks of that corporation. The enterprise storage server, using deduplication, can store only the first occurrence of the logo and replace subsequent occurrences with pointers to the earlier stored one.

The above example highlights key differences between deduplication and algorithms used to compress single files. These latter, by now standard, data compression approaches include DEFLATE [1] (based on LZ77 [2] and used in the popular zlib and gzip utilities) and PPM (prediction by partial match) [3]. They operate by finding small amounts of local redundancy. For example, DEFLATE uses a 32 kB sliding window and restricts the match length to a maximum of 258 B [1] (although the typical match length is likely considerably smaller—on the order of a few tens of bytes). Similarly, PPM typically uses a context of up to 10 B [4]. In contrast, data deduplication finds larger amounts of global redundancy. For example, [5] reports finding duplicates on the order of a few up to hundred kB over ranges of several hundreds of GB up to a few TB. Thus, the main difference between data deduplication and single-file compression approaches is the scale at which they operate.

To deal with this large scale, deduplication algorithms use an approach called chunking. In the simplest version, the stream of data (of size up to several TB) is split into chunks of fixed size (say 8 kB). The algorithm sequentially processes the stream of chunks. For each chunk, the algorithm computes a hash value, used as key into a hash table. If the hash table does not already contain an entry with that key, the algorithm enters the chunk into the hash table (hash collisions can be avoided by proper dimensioning of the length of the hash value). The chunk is then deduplicated by replacing it with its hash value. The hash table and the sequence of chunk hashes are stored on disk. Since indexing into the hash table can be performed in constant time, this chunking approach is computationally efficient and can be performed over large amounts of data.

This fixed-length chunking has the disadvantage that it is susceptible to shifts of the duplicate data blocks. Returning to the corporate logo example, if the positions of the logo in the data stream are not aligned with respect to the chunk boundaries, then duplicates will not be discovered. To address this issue, most deduplication systems instead use variable-length chunking, in which the chunk boundaries are defined by the occurrence of short pre-defined marker sequences. The chunks now have variable

random length. By choosing the length of the marker sequence, the expected length of the chunks can be controlled. The use of marker sequences “resynchronizes” the appearance of shifted redundant data blocks, allowing to successfully deduplicate them.

Deduplication has received significant amounts of attention in the Computer Systems literature, as surveyed in Section I-C. It is also widely used in practice; for example, it is reportedly being used both by Dropbox [6] and by Microsoft Windows Server 2012 [5]. Despite its significance, data deduplication seems not to have been studied from a theoretical point of view. In particular, an information-theoretic analysis of its performance limits is missing.

B. Summary of Contributions

This paper provides such an information-theoretic analysis of data deduplication. The main results of this paper are as follows:

- It introduces a simple source model, which captures the long-range memory and the synchronization issues observed in the data deduplication problem.
- It formalizes two concise versions of the data deduplication approach, one with fixed chunk length and one with variable chunk length. It also proposes a third, novel, multi-chunk deduplication scheme.
- It analyzes the performance of these three schemes. The fixed-length deduplication scheme is shown to be close to optimal when the source-block lengths are constant and known a-priori. However, when the source-block lengths are variable, fixed-length deduplication is shown to be substantially suboptimal. The reason for this suboptimality is formally shown to be due to the lack of synchronization between source block and deduplication chunk boundaries.
- The variable-length deduplication scheme is shown to better handle this lack of synchronization. Careful choice of marker sequence length (or, equivalently, expected deduplication-chunk length) is shown to be critical for good performance of variable-length deduplication.
- Finally, the proposed multi-chunk deduplication scheme is shown to be much less sensitive to the expected deduplication chunk length. As a consequence, it can better adapt to the source statistics, and has order-optimal performance under fairly mild conditions.

C. Related Work

The use of variable-length chunking for the purposes of detecting similar files in large file systems was proposed in [7]. Deduplication based on this variable-length chunking idea was proposed in [8] in the context of a network file system.

The largest gains of data deduplication are achieved when storing different versions of the same data such as in archival storage [9], [10] and backup systems [11]–[13]. However, data deduplication has also been successfully applied to primary storage systems [5], [14]. A further area of application is virtual machine hosting centers, where data deduplication is used for virtual machine migration [15] and for virtual machine disk image storage [16].

As already mentioned, data deduplication has not yet been investigated from an information-theoretic point of view. The closest problems in the information theory literature are compression with unknown alphabets [17], also known as multi-alphabet source coding [18], [19], or the zero-frequency problem [4]. In fact, as will become clearer in the following, the large repeated blocks in the source data can be interpreted as being part of an unknown alphabet that has to be learned and described by the encoder.

The related problem of file synchronization has been studied extensively in the information-theoretic literature [20]–[26]. The synchronization problem is concerned with duplicates between two versions of the same file. In contrast, deduplication deals with a large number of duplicated files or data blocks, and the correspondence between them is not known a-priori.

D. Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II provides a formal definition of the problem setting, including the source model and the deduplication schemes. Section III presents the main results. All proofs are deferred to appendices.

II. PROBLEM SETTING

A. Source Description

We consider a source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, of size $|\mathcal{X}| = A$, generated randomly as follows. Fix a distribution P_L over $\mathbb{N}$ with finite mean $\mathbb{E}(L)$. Generate A independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_A$ from P_L . We next generate a sequence of binary strings $X_a \in \{0, 1\}^{L_a}$ for each $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, A\}$: Starting with $a = 1$, choose X_a uniformly at random from $\{0, 1\}^{L_a} \setminus \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{a-1}\}$. Thus, each X_a is a binary string of length L_a , called a source symbol in the following. Finally, the source alphabet $\mathcal{X} \subset \{0, 1\}^*$ (where $\{0, 1\}^*$ denotes the set of all finite-length binary sequences) is defined as the union of all the source symbols,

$$\mathcal{X} \triangleq \{X_a\}_{a=1}^A.$$

Note that $|\mathcal{X}|$ is equal to A by construction of the X_a . To simplify some of the derivations later on, we assume that L is tightly concentrated around its mean, specifically that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}(L)/2 \leq L \leq 2\mathbb{E}(L)) = 1$. Furthermore, to ensure that the source alphabet generation is always well defined, we assume that $2 \leq A \leq 2^{\mathbb{E}(L)/2-1}$.

From this randomly generated source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, we now generate a random source sequence S as follows. Choose B elements $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B$ i.i.d. uniformly at random from $\mathcal{X}$. Thus, each Y_b is an element of $\{0, 1\}^*$. The sequence Y_b is referred to as a source block. Construct the source sequence S as the concatenation $Y_1 Y_2 \dots Y_B$ of $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B$. We emphasize that S is an element of $\{0, 1\}^*$, in other words, the boundaries of the source blocks $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B$ are *not* preserved. Denote by $\ell(S)$ the (random) length of S .

Example 1. Assume the source alphabet is randomly generated as $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 00, 10, 01100, 001100\}$. From this, $B = 2$ elements are drawn i.i.d. uniformly at random, say $Y_1 = 10$ and $Y_2 = 01100$. The resulting source sequence is then $S = Y_1 Y_2 = 1001100$. Note that, from S alone, it is not clear if S was generated as the concatenation of 10 and 01100 or as the concatenation of 1 and 001100. There is a third possible parsing of S into the five elements 1, 00, 1, 1, and 00 from $\mathcal{X}$. However, knowing $B = 2$, this third parsing is not valid. $\diamond$

Our goal is to compress the source sequence S , knowing only P_L , A , and B . In particular, the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ and the parsing into the source blocks $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B$ are *not* known. More formally, we are looking for a prefix-free source code for the random variable S . We have a complete statistical description of S and (since $\mathbb{E}(L)$ is finite) its entropy $H(S)$ is well defined. The expected rate R^* of the optimal prefix-free source code for S is thus bounded as

$$H(S) \leq R^* \leq H(S) + 1.$$

Example 2. We illustrate the order and relative size of the various quantities in the problem setting using data from a recent large-scale primary (i.e., non backup) data deduplication study [5]. The length $\ell(S)$ of the source sequence ranges from several hundreds of GB to a few TB. The expected value of the length $L_a = \ell(X_a)$ of the source symbols is a bit harder to quantify (since the notion of source symbol itself is a model abstraction), but the experiments in [5] suggest that reasonable numbers range from a few kB to a few MB. The number B of source blocks is consequently on the order of perhaps 10^5 to 10^9 . As in our model, the data in [5] indicates that duplicates are not localized, but occur over the entire source string. In other words, the source has long-range dependence. The number of distinct source symbols A

is again hard to quantify, but the results in [5], [12] suggest that, depending on the scenario, A should be somewhere in the range $0.01B$ to B . $\diamond$

There are several differences between the source model introduced here and the standard source coding setup. First, the source considered here is nonergodic in the following sense. As $B \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain a stochastic process $S = (S_1, S_2, \dots)$ with each element S_i taking values in $\{0, 1\}$. This process is not ergodic. Indeed, let $A = 1$ so that the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ contains a single symbol.¹ Then, with nonzero probability, that single source symbol is the all-zero sequence, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \{00 \dots 0\}$, in which case $S_1, S_2, \dots$ is the infinite sequence of all zeros. Since $\mathbb{P}(S_1 = 1) = 1/2$, this shows that the process is not ergodic.

Second, the standard setting is to consider the source statistics, captured by $\mathbb{E}(L)$ and A , as fixed and to let the length of the source, captured by B , go to infinity. Instead, as indicated by Example 2, we are interested here in the regime when B may be of similar order as A . Thus, we here allow the source parameters $\mathbb{E}(L)$ and A to grow with B .

Finally, given the size of the problem and in particular the long range over which the source exhibits memory (see again Example 2), we are interested in compression schemes that scale well. In the next section we describe three such schemes.

B. Deduplication Schemes

We next provide a formal (somewhat stylized) description of the deduplication approach. There are two types of deduplication schemes that appear frequently in the literature, fixed-length and variable-length, which are presented first. Then, we introduce a novel variant of the deduplication approach, termed multi-chunk deduplication.

For fixed-length deduplication, we fix a chunk length D . The source sequence S is parsed into substrings of length D (except for the final substring that may have length less than D). Let $\{Z_c\}_{c=1}^C$ be this fixed-length parsing of S with $C \triangleq \lceil \ell(S)/D \rceil$. Each Z_c (with $c < C$) is an element of $\{0, 1\}^D$ referred to as a deduplication chunk.

The encoding algorithm starts by describing the length $\ell(S)$ of the source string using a prefix-free code for the positive integers (such as an Elias code [27]). The encoding algorithm then traverses through the chunks, starting at $c = 1$, and constructs a growing dictionary of chunks seen up to c . Chunk c is encoded either as a new dictionary entry or as a pointer into the dictionary at that point (depending on whether the chunk is new or already in the dictionary). If chunk c is new, then it is encoded as the bit 1 followed by the binary string Z_c itself. If chunk c is not new, then it is encoded as the bit 0 followed by a pointer into the dictionary. This fixed-length deduplication scheme is prefix free. Its expected (with respect to S) number of encoded bits is denoted by R_{FL} .

Example 1 (Continued). Continuing with Example 1, for $S = 1001100$ and with $D = 2$, the fixed-length chunks are $Z_1 = 10$, $Z_2 = 01$, $Z_3 = 10$, $Z_4 = 0$. When the encoding process terminates, the chunk dictionary contains the elements $\{10, 01, 0\}$. $\diamond$

Remark 1: Without the initial encoding of $\ell(S)$, the source code is still nonsingular (i.e., no two different S have the same codeword), and can hence be decoded. However, because of the variable-length nature of the source, the code may no longer be prefix free. The initial encoding of $\ell(S)$ is therefore necessary to guarantee that the source code is prefix free.

For variable-length deduplication, we fix a marker sequence, which we take here to be the all-zero sequence of length M denoted by 0^M . The source sequence S is then split into a random number C of chunks using this marker. More formally, the source sequence is parsed as $Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 \dots Z_C$, where each chunk Z_c (except for perhaps the last one) contains a single appearance of the sequence 0^M at the end.

¹The assumption that $A = 1$ is made here solely for ease of exposition—the same argument works also under the assumption throughout the remainder of the paper that $A \geq 2$.

The encoding algorithm again starts by describing the length $\ell(S)$ of the source string using a prefix-free code for the positive integers. The parsing itself is also performed using a growing dictionary of chunks, similar to the fixed-length scheme. If chunk c is new (meaning not yet in the dictionary), it is encoded as the bit 1 followed by the binary string Z_c itself. Since the marker sequence 0^M indicates the end of Z_c , we do not need to store the length $\ell(Z_c)$ explicitly. If chunk c is not new, then it is encoded, as before, as the bit 0 followed by a pointer into the dictionary. This variable-length deduplication scheme is also prefix free. Its expected (with respect to S) number of encoded bits is denoted by R_{VL} .

Example 1 (Continued). Continuing again with Example 1, for $S = 1001100$ and with $M = 2$, the variable-length chunks are $Z_1 = 100$, $Z_2 = 1100$. When the encoding process terminates, the chunk dictionary contains the elements $\{100, 1100\}$. $\diamond$

Example 2 (Continued). For a more realistic example, consider again the setting for the primary data deduplication study [5] from Example 2. The system uses variable-length chunking with expected chunk lengths ranging from 4kB to 64kB. The corresponding marker sequence has length ranging from 12 to 16 bits. [5] finds that around 50 % of chunks appear only once, and that the vast majority of chunks have less than 32 duplicates. It is worth pointing out that the number of duplicates may be higher in backup or archival scenarios, where deduplication ratios of 20 to 1 or higher can be achieved [12]. $\diamond$

We finally describe the novel, multi-chunk deduplication algorithm. We again split the source sequence into a random number C of chunks using the marker 0^M , however, this time we ensure that each chunk has length at least 2^{M-1} . More formally, the source sequence is parsed as $Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 \dots Z_C$, where each chunk Z_c (except for perhaps the last one) is the shortest string of length at least 2^{M-1} ending in 0^M .

Example 3. Multi-chunk deduplication with marker length $M = 4$ parses the source sequence $S = 1100000000100001000010$ into the chunks $Z_1 = 11000000$, $Z_2 = 001000010000$, $Z_3 = 10$. $\diamond$

The encoding algorithm again describes the length $\ell(S)$ of the source string using a prefix-free code for the positive integers, followed by a parsing of S using a growing dictionary of chunks. Consider the encoding of chunk c . Assume first that it is new, and consider the sequence $Z_c, Z_{c+1}, \dots$ of chunks. Let V_c be the largest integer such that $Z_c, Z_{c+1}, \dots, Z_{c+V_c-1}$ are all new. These new chunks are then encoded together as the bit 1, followed by an encoding of V_c using a prefix-free code for the positive integers, followed by the binary string $Z_c Z_{c+1} \dots Z_{c+V_c-1}$. Since each chunk $Z_c, Z_{c+1}, \dots$ is terminated by the occurrence of the marker sequence 0^M after position $2^{M-1} - M$, we do not need to store their lengths explicitly. The encoding process continues with chunk $c + V_c$.

Assume next that chunk c is not new, and consider the sequence $Z_c, Z_{c+1}, \dots$ of chunks. Let $\tilde{c} < c$ be the smallest index satisfying $Z_{\tilde{c}} = Z_c$. Such an index $\tilde{c}$ exists since chunk c is not new; in fact $\tilde{c}$ corresponds to the first time chunk Z_c was seen and hence entered into the dictionary. Consider the corresponding dictionary entry and the list of subsequent entries. Let W_c be the largest integer such that the first W_c entries in this list are equal to $Z_c, Z_{c+1}, \dots, Z_{c+W_c-1}$. Then the chunks c through $c + W_c - 1$ are encoded together as the bit 0, followed by an encoding of W_c using a prefix-free code for the positive integers, followed by a pointer into the dictionary pointing to chunk $Z_{\tilde{c}}$. Observe that the pointer is to an individual chunk, even if that chunk was part of a larger group of chunks encoded jointly. The encoding process continues with chunk $c + W_c$.

This multi-chunk deduplication scheme is also prefix free. Its expected (with respect to S) number of encoded bits is denoted by R_{MC} .

C. Performance Metric

The standard performance criterion is the redundancy normalized by the expected length of the source string, e.g., $(R_{FL} - R^*)/\mathbb{E}\ell(S)$. However, since in our setting R^* itself may be $o(\mathbb{E}\ell(S))$, this normalized redundancy may not be a meaningful quantity. We therefore instead adopt the ratio R_{FL}/R^* (and similar for R_{VL} , R_{MC}) as our performance metric.

A deduplication scheme with rate R is *order optimal* if $R \leq O(R^*)$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$. It is *asymptotically optimal* if $R \leq (1 + o(1))R^*$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

As indicated in Section II-A, while the standard approach is to fix the source alphabet parameters, i.e., $\mathbb{E}(L)$ and A , and to consider the asymptotic behavior as the source length (as measured by B) increases, we are here instead interested in the behavior as the source alphabet parameters increase together with the source length B .

III. MAIN RESULTS

The main result of this paper is an information-theoretic analysis of data deduplication for the source model defined in Section II-A. We start with the fixed-length deduplication scheme as described in Section II-B. The first result analyzes the performance of this scheme assuming a constant source-symbol length, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(L = L) = 1$.

Theorem 1. *Consider the source model with B source blocks drawn with replacement from the A source symbols of constant length L . The performance of the fixed-length deduplication scheme with chunk length $D = L$ satisfies then*

$$1 \leq \frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} \leq 1 + 7 \frac{B + \log(L)}{\min\{A, B\}(L - 1) + (B - A)^+ \log(A/2)}$$

for B large enough.²

The proof of Theorem 1 is reported in Appendix A. The most interesting regime is when the number of source blocks B is at least as large as the number of source symbols A , in which case the upper bound in Theorem 1 can be simplified to

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} \leq 1 + \frac{7B}{(B - A) \log(A/2)} + \frac{7 \log(L)}{L - 1}.$$

Thus, as long as $\omega(1) \leq A \leq (1 - \varepsilon)B$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$ (which implies that $L = \omega(1)$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$ by assumption), we have that $R_{\text{FL}} \leq (1 + o(1))R^*$ as B grows, showing the asymptotic optimality of fixed-length deduplication with known and constant source-symbol lengths

Example 4. Motivated by Example 2, consider the source with $A = 10^5$ symbols of fixed length $L = 10^6$ bits and with $B = 10^6$ source blocks. Theorem 1 shows then that fixed-length deduplication with chunk length $D = L$ has performance satisfying

$$R^* \leq R_{\text{FL}} \leq 1.00007R^*,$$

i.e., very close to optimal. ◇

Unfortunately, the asymptotic optimality of fixed-length deduplication relies crucially on the assumption of known and fixed source-symbol length. While this assumption may be reasonable in some scenarios (such as for virtual machine disk image deduplication [16]), it is usually not valid. As soon as this assumption is relaxed, fixed-length deduplication can be substantially suboptimal, as the next example shows.

Example 5. Consider the scenario with $A = 2$ source symbols. Set the number of source blocks to $B = 3L$. To start with, assume the source-symbol length is constant, $L = L$. By Theorem 1, fixed-length deduplication with chunk length $D = L$ is then within a constant factor of optimal as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, assume next that the symbol-length distribution P_L assigns equal mass to the values L and $L + 1$. Appendix B then shows that fixed-length deduplication with chunk length $D = L$ has rate satisfying

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} \geq \Omega(B)$$

²All logarithms are to the base two.

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, even with only two source symbols, the fixed-length deduplication scheme can be substantially suboptimal.

The reason for the bad performance of fixed-length deduplication is that the source blocks and the deduplication chunks are not properly synchronized. Initially, the deduplication chunks are aligned with the source blocks. However, whenever a source block of length $L + 1$ is observed, the deduplication chunks shift by one bit with respect to the source blocks. Over time, the boundary between deduplication chunks takes on all L possible offsets with respect to the source block boundaries. Due to these L possible starting points, the fixed-length deduplication scheme encounters $\Theta(L)$ distinct chunks instead of the only $A = 2$ distinct source symbols, resulting in the factor $\Theta(L) = \Theta(B)$ overhead compared to the optimal scheme. This argument is made precise in Appendix B. $\diamond$

From Example 5, we see that the (general) deduplication problem is fundamentally one of synchronizing deduplication chunks with source blocks. The variable-length deduplication scheme, described in Section II-B, utilizes marker sequences to achieve this synchronization. The next theorem bounds its performance.

Theorem 2. *Consider the source model with B source blocks drawn with replacement from the A source symbols of expected length $\mathbb{E}(L)$. The performance of the variable-length deduplication scheme with optimized marker length M satisfies then*

$$1 \leq \frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \leq 1 + \frac{5B(1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}) \log(B\mathbb{E}(L))}{(\min\{A, B\}(\mathbb{E}(L) - 1) + (B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - 2B \log(2\mathbb{E}(L)))^+},$$

for B large enough.

The proof of Theorem 2 is reported in Appendix C. We illustrate this result with two examples.

Example 4 (Continued). Consider again the scenario with $A = 10^5$ source symbols and with $B = 10^6$ source blocks. This time, the source symbols are not of constant length, but have the same expected length $\mathbb{E}(L) = 10^6$ bits as before. Theorem 2 shows then that variable-length deduplication has performance satisfying

$$R^* \leq R_{\text{VL}} \leq 3R^*,$$

i.e., is within a factor 3 of optimal. By numerically optimizing the value of the marker length M , this factor can be further reduced to 1.6. $\diamond$

Example 5 (Continued). Consider again the scenario with $A = 2$ source symbols with symbol-length distribution P_L assigning equal mass to the values L and $L + 1$, and with $B = 3L$ source blocks. Recall that the fixed-length deduplication scheme had a rate at least order B times larger than the optimal scheme:

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} \geq \Omega(B).$$

On the other hand, by tightening the arguments in the proof of Theorem 2 for the case $B > A^2$ (see Appendix D), the rate of the variable-length deduplication scheme satisfies

$$\frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \leq O(\log^3 B).$$

Thus, variable-length deduplication is only suboptimal by at most a polylogarithmic as opposed to a linear factor. $\diamond$

The analysis in the proof of Theorem 2 in Appendix C indicates that the optimal choice of the marker length M , governing the expected chunk length of the variable-length deduplication scheme, balances two competing requirements. On the one hand, for each already encountered chunk, we need to encode a pointer into the dictionary. A smaller chunk length increases both the number of chunks that need to

be encoded and the size of the pointers. On the other hand, the chunks covering the boundaries of two source blocks will usually not be contained in the dictionary (since there are A^2 such possible boundaries for A source symbols), and will have to be encoded directly. Hence, a larger chunk length increases the amount of bits contained in inefficiently encodable boundary chunks. The choice of marker length $M \approx 0.5 \log \mathbb{E}(L)$ in the proof of Theorem 2 splits each source block into an average of about $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}$ chunks of expected length about $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}$, which balances these two detrimental effects.

Unfortunately, even with this optimal choice of marker length, using deduplication chunks that have lengths of different order than the source blocks can lead to asymptotically significantly suboptimal performance. This is demonstrated with the next example.

Example 6. Consider the scenario with $A = \sqrt{B}$ source symbols of constant length $L = L = \sqrt{B}$. From the preceding discussion, we see that this is the worst-case situation for variable-length deduplication, in which we can expect to see all possible A^2 different boundary chunks. A slightly tightened version of Theorem 2 (which omits the last term in the denominator using that L is constant) together with a lower bound derived in Appendix E, show that then

$$\Omega(B^{1/4} \log^{-2}(B)) \leq \frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \leq O(B^{1/4})$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. This has two implications: First, that Theorem 2 is tight to within a polylogarithmic factor in B for this setting; and second that variable-length deduplication can still be polynomially suboptimal. $\diamond$

The multi-chunk deduplication scheme proposed in this paper circumvents this trade-off by encoding multiple chunks jointly. This allows to choose the expected chunk length to be quite small, thereby limiting the effect of the boundary chunks, without the penalty of increased number of dictionary pointers. The next theorem bounds the performance of this scheme.

Theorem 3. Consider the source model with B source blocks drawn with replacement from the A source symbols of expected length $\mathbb{E}(L)$. The performance of the multi-chunk deduplication scheme with optimized marker length M satisfies then

$$1 \leq \frac{R_{\text{MC}}}{R^*} \leq 1 + O\left(\frac{B \log(AB\mathbb{E}(L))}{(\min\{A, B\}(\mathbb{E}(L) - 1) + (B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - 2B \log(2\mathbb{E}(L)))^+}\right)$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 3 is reported in Appendix F. The theorem shows that, under the fairly mild conditions $B^{\Omega(1)} \leq A \leq (1 - \varepsilon)B$ and $\mathbb{E}(L) \leq A^{\varepsilon/3}$ for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$, multi-chunk deduplication is within a constant factor of optimal as $B \rightarrow \infty$. Further, if $A \leq B \leq o(A\mathbb{E}(L)/\log(A\mathbb{E}(L)))$, then multi-chunk deduplication is asymptotically optimal as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 4 (Continued). Consider again the scenario with $A = 10^5$ source symbols and with $B = 10^6$ source blocks with expected length $\mathbb{E}(L) = 10^6$ bits. Theorem 3 (using the explicit constant in the order notation from Appendix F) shows then that multi-chunk deduplication has performance satisfying

$$R^* \leq R_{\text{MC}} \leq 1.2R^*.$$

By numerically optimizing the marker length M , this factor can be further reduced to 1.05. Thus, the proposed multi-chunk deduplication scheme is quite close to optimal in this setting. $\diamond$

Example 6 (Continued). Consider again the scenario with $A = \sqrt{B}$ source symbols of constant length $L = L = \sqrt{B}$. Recall that the variable-length deduplication scheme had a rate at least polynomially suboptimal:

$$\frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \geq \Omega(B^{1/5}).$$

On the other hand, a slightly tightened version of Theorem 3, which omits the last term in the denominator using that L is constant, shows that the rate of the multi-chunk deduplication scheme satisfies

$$\frac{R_{\text{MC}}}{R^*} \leq O(1)$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, multi-chunk deduplication is order optimal in this case, as opposed to the polynomial loss factor of variable-length deduplication. $\diamond$

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF FIXED-LENGTH DEDUPLICATION WITH CONSTANT SOURCE-SYMBOL LENGTH (PROOF OF THEOREM 1)

This appendix analyzes the rate of fixed-length deduplication for constant source-symbol length. The length $\ell(S)$ of the source is in this case the constant BL . Set the deduplication chunk length D to be equal to the fixed length L of the source blocks. The deduplication chunks $Z_1, \dots, Z_C$ are then equal to the source blocks $Y_1, \dots, Y_B$.

We start with an upper bound on the rate R_{FL} of the fixed-length deduplication scheme. The initial encoding of the length $\ell(S) = BL$ using a universal code for the integers takes at most $2\log(BL) + 3$ bits (see, e.g., [28, Lemma 13.5.1]). Consider then the encoding of some chunk c . The flag indicating if the chunk is already in the dictionary takes one bit. If the chunk is new, then it is added to the dictionary using D bits. If the chunk is already in the dictionary, then a pointer into the dictionary is encoded. Let $\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}$ be the dictionary when processing chunk c . Then this encoded pointer takes at most $\log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| + 1$ bits.

The expected rate of fixed-length deduplication is thus upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{FL}} &\leq 2\log(BL) + 3 + \sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{E} \left(1 + I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} D + I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} (\log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| + 1) \right) \\ &\leq 2\log(BL) + 3 + 2C + \sum_{c=1}^C \left(D\mathbb{P}(Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}) + A^{-1}\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $I_{\{\cdot\}}$ denotes the indicator function, and where we have used that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E}(I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \mid |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}(Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1} \mid |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|) \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \right) \\ &= A^{-1}\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|). \end{aligned}$$

Using that $C = B$, $D = L$, and $Z_c = Y_c$, this upper bound can be rewritten as

$$R_{\text{FL}} \leq 2\log(BL) + 3 + 2B + \sum_{b=1}^B \left(L\mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + A^{-1}\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|) \right), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}^b \triangleq \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_b\} \quad (2)$$

denotes the set of all *distinct* source blocks seen up to block b .

We continue with a lower bound on the rate R^* of the optimal code. Since the code is prefix free, its rate is lower bounded as

$$R^* \geq H(S) \quad (3)$$

(see, e.g., [28, Theorem 5.4.1]). As the source blocks are of constant length, we have

$$H(S) = H(Y^B) = \sum_{b=1}^B H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}). \quad (4)$$

Each term in the sum on the right-hand side satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}) &\geq H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, I_{\{Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Conditioned on $Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$ and Y^{b-1} , the source block Y_b is uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^L \setminus \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) &= \mathbb{E}(\log|\{0, 1\}^L \setminus \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| | Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\log(2^L - |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|) | Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \log(2^L - A) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} L - 1 \end{aligned}$$

using that $|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \leq A$ for (a) and that $A \leq 2^{L-1}$ by assumption for (b). This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})(L - 1). \quad (6)$$

Conditioned on $Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$ and Y^{b-1} , the source block Y_b is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) &= \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| = a) \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1} | |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| = a) H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| = a, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| = a) a A^{-1} \log(a) \\ &= A^{-1} \mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Combining (3)–(7) yields

$$R^* \geq \sum_{b=1}^B \left((L - 1) \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + A^{-1} \mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|) \right). \quad (8)$$

To obtain a more explicit expression, we further lower bound R^* as

$$\begin{aligned} R^* &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{b=1}^B \left((L - 1) (1 - (b - 1)/A)^+ + A^{-1} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} (L - 1) \sum_{b=1}^B (1 - (b - 1)/A)^+ + \sum_{b=1}^B (1 - (1 - 1/A)^{b-1}) \log(A(1 - (1 - 1/A)^{b-1})) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} 0.5(L - 1) \min\{A, B\} + 0.5(B - A)^+ \log(A/2), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where (a) follows from $|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \leq b - 1$ and from the convexity of $x \log x$ and Jensen's inequality, (b) follows from

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| = A(1 - (1 - 1/A)^{b-1})$$

since the $\mathbf{Y}^{b-1}$ are chosen uniformly with replacement from the set $\mathcal{X}$ of cardinality A , and (c) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b=1}^B (1 - (b-1)/A)^+ &= \begin{cases} B(2A - B + 1)/(2A), & \text{if } B \leq A, \\ (A+1)/2, & \text{if } B > A. \end{cases} \\ &\geq 0.5 \min\{A, B\} \end{aligned}$$

and from

$$1 - (1 - 1/A)^{b-1} \geq 1 - \exp(-1) \geq 0.5$$

for $b \geq A + 1$.

From (1) and (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{FL}} - R^* &\leq 2 \log(BL) + 3 + 2B + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\leq 2 \log(BL) + 3 + 3B. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (9) yields

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} - 1 \leq \frac{2 \log(BL) + 3 + 3B}{0.5(L-1) \min\{A, B\} + 0.5(B-A)^+ \log(A/2)}.$$

For B large enough, this can be simplified as

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} - 1 \leq 7 \frac{\log(L) + B}{(L-1) \min\{A, B\} + (B-A)^+ \log(A/2)},$$

concluding the proof. ■

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF FIXED-LENGTH DEDUPLICATION WITH VARIABLE SOURCE-SYMBOL LENGTH (EXAMPLE 5)

This appendix contains the formal analysis for Example 5. We start with an upper bound on R^* . Since R^* is the rate of the optimal prefix-free code, it is upper bounded as

$$R^* \leq H(\mathbf{S}) + 1$$

(see, e.g., [28, Theorem 5.4.1]). Now,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{S}) &\leq H(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{Y}^B) \\ &= H(\mathbf{Y}^B) + H(\mathbf{S} | \mathbf{Y}^B) \\ &= H(\mathbf{Y}^B) \\ &\leq H(\mathbf{Y}^B, \mathcal{X}) \\ &= H(\mathcal{X}) + H(\mathbf{Y}^B | \mathcal{X}) \\ &\leq A(L+2) + B \log(A). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$R^* \leq A(L+2) + B \log(A) + 1. \tag{10}$$

We continue with a lower bound on the rate of fixed-length deduplication. We set the chunk length D to be equal to L . Since the source blocks have lengths either L or $L+1$, the deduplication chunk boundaries may no longer be aligned with the source block boundaries. Define the offset of the current chunk as the distance from that chunk end to the start of the next source block (see Fig. 1(a)).




Fig. 1. Evolution of the offset between source block and deduplication chunk boundaries and corresponding Markov chain.

Assume for the moment that the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ has one source symbol of length L and one of length $L+1$ (this happens with probability $1/2$). The evolution of this offset is then governed by a Markov chain with $L+1$ states as depicted in Fig. 1(b). The initial state is 0 and all outgoing edges of a state have uniform probability. Observe that in each state we make a transition to the right (modulo $L+1$) with probability at least $1/2$ or stay in the current state with probability at most $1/2$. Hence, after $2L$ transitions, we have traversed the chain at least once in expectation.

Consider now the two source symbols X_1 and X_2 (recall that $A = 2$). And assume for the moment that $\ell(X_1) = L$. By the law of large numbers, about $1/4$ of the deduplication chunks will be a subset of X_1X_1 (the concatenation of X_1 with itself) with high probability for L large enough. Consider all possible chunks of length L starting with different offsets in X_1X_1 . We next argue that with high probability all these L different chunks are unique.

By [29, Example 10.5], there are

$$\sum_{d|L} \mu(d) 2^{L/d}$$

binary sequences of length L for which all circular shifts are distinct (these are called aperiodic necklaces in Combinatorics), where $\mu(d) \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ is the Möbius function. Since $\mu(1) = 1$ and $\mu(d) \geq -1$, we can lower bound this as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d|L} \mu(d) 2^{L/d} &\geq 2^L - \sum_{d|L, d>1} 2^{L/d} \\ &\geq 2^L - 2^{L/2+1} \\ &= 2^L(1 - o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that, as $L \rightarrow \infty$, the vast majority of binary sequences have the property that all their circular shifts are distinct. In particular, with high probability X_1 will have this property.

Putting these arguments together, we obtain the following. With probability $1/2$ the two source symbols have distinct lengths. With probability at least $1/2$, the shorter of the two source symbols (the one with length L) will have distinct circular shifts for L large enough. If $B = 3L$ and L large enough, then we will see every possible deduplication chunk offset at least once with probability at least $1/2$. Moreover, with probability $1/2$ at least $L/8$ of the deduplication chunks will contain circular shifts of the shorter source symbol. Since each of these are distinct, they will all have to be entered into the dictionary, using L bits each. Thus,

$$R_{\text{FL}} \geq 2^{-7} L^2. \quad (11)$$

Combining (10) (with $A = 2$ and $B = 3L$) and (11) shows that

$$\frac{R_{\text{FL}}}{R^*} \geq \frac{2^{-7}L^2}{5L+5} = \Omega(L) = \Omega(B).$$

Thus, even with only two source symbols, the fixed-length deduplication scheme can be substantially suboptimal. $\blacksquare$

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIABLE-LENGTH DEDUPLICATION (PROOF OF THEOREM 2)

We start with an upper bound on the rate R_{VL} of variable-length deduplication. The initial encoding of the length $\ell(S)$ using a universal code for the integers takes at most $2 \log \ell(S) + 3$ bits (see again [28, Lemma 13.5.1]). Consider then the encoding of chunk c . The flag indicating if the chunk is already in the dictionary takes one bit. If the chunk is new, then it is added to the dictionary using $\ell(Z_c)$ bits. If the chunk is already in the dictionary, then a pointer into the dictionary is encoded. Let again $\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}$ be the dictionary when encoding chunk c . Then this encoded pointer takes at most $\log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| + 1$ bits.

Let $R_{\text{VL}}(S)$ be the rate of variable-length deduplication for a particular source string S , so that $R_{\text{VL}} = \mathbb{E}(R_{\text{VL}}(S))$. The rate $R_{\text{VL}}(S)$ is then upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{VL}}(S) &\leq 2 \log \ell(S) + 3 + \sum_{c=1}^C \left(1 + I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) + I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} (\log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| + 1) \right) \\ &\leq 2 \log \ell(S) + 3 + 2C + \sum_{c=1}^C I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) + \sum_{c=1}^C I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, we have two distinct parsings of the source sequence S . The first is defined by the source blocks, $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B$; the second is defined by the deduplication chunks $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_C$. We would like to relate these two parsings. To this end, let $\mathcal{C}_b$ denote the indices of those chunks from S starting in Y_b . We say that a chunk Z_c is in Y_b if $c \in \mathcal{C}_b$.




Fig. 2. Source blocks and corresponding deduplication chunks for variable-length deduplication.

Example 7. Consider $Y_1 = 100110110001$, $Y_2 = 01110010$, $Y_3 = 010011$ so that the source string is $S = 10011011000101110010010011$. The parsing of S into chunks with marker $0^M = 00$ yields $Z_1 = 100$, $Z_2 = 1101100$, $Z_3 = 01011100$, $Z_4 = 100$, $Z_5 = 100$, $Z_6 = 11$. This situation is depicted in Fig. 2. In this setting $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{4\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{5, 6\}$. $\diamond$

Consider the chunks in source block Y_b . As Fig. 2 shows, some of them depend on the values of the neighboring source blocks Y_{b-1} and Y_{b+1} . We call these the “boundary” chunks of Y_b and denote their indices by $\partial\mathcal{C}_b$. Other chunks in Y_b are the same irrespective of the values of the neighboring source blocks. We call these the “interior” chunks of Y_b and denote their indices by $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$. Formally, for a source block Y_b , we say that Z_c with $c \in \mathcal{C}_b$ is an interior chunk if it appears in the variable-length chunking of every sequence $y_{b-1}Y_b y_{b+1}$ with $y_{b-1}, y_{b+1} \in \{0, 1\}^*$. Any chunk Z_c that is not an interior chunk is defined to be a boundary chunk. By definition, the interior chunks thus have the property that if $Y_b = Y_{\tilde{b}}$, then $\{Z_c : c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ\} = \{Z_c : c \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{b}}^\circ\}$. Note that this last conclusion does generally not hold for $\partial\mathcal{C}_b$ and $\partial\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{b}}$.

Example 7 (Continued). In this setting we have $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ = \{2\}$, $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{C}_3^\circ = \emptyset$ and $\partial\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, 3\}$, $\partial\mathcal{C}_2 = \{4\}$, $\partial\mathcal{C}_3 = \{5, 6\}$. $\diamond$




Fig. 3. Boundary chunks (indicated by underbraces) as defined by variable-length deduplication for marker length $M = 2$. The vertical line $|$ indicates the boundary between the source blocks Y_{b-1} and Y_b .

Usually, $\partial\mathcal{C}_b$ contains only one chunk index, which corresponds to the final chunk starting in Y_b but ending in Y_{b+1} (see Figs. 3(a) and 3(b)). However, $\partial\mathcal{C}_b$ can contain additional chunk indices. In particular, if the boundary between Y_{b-1} and Y_b forms a marker sequence then the first chunk starting in Y_b may also be a boundary chunk (see Figs. 3(b)–3(e)). Finally, if Y_b starts with between $M + 1$ and $2M - 1$ zeros (where M is the marker length), then it may contain a third boundary chunk consisting of the marker sequence 0^M by itself (see Fig. 3(d)). Observe that when Y_b starts with $2M$ or more zeros, then there is always a 0^M chunk, irrespective of the value of Y_{b-1} , and therefore 0^M is not a boundary chunk in this case (see Fig. 3(e)). In general, we thus have $|\partial\mathcal{C}_b| \leq 3$. We will later choose M such that $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{C}_b| = \omega(1)$ as $\mathbb{E}(L) \rightarrow \infty$, in which case the vast majority of indices in $\mathcal{C}_b$ will correspond to interior chunks.

Let us return to the upper bound (12) for $R_{\text{VL}}(S)$, and consider the first sum corresponding to new chunks. We can now rewrite this sum as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{c=1}^C I_{\{Z_c \notin Z^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) &= \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin Z^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \\ &= \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ} I_{\{Z_c \notin Z^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) + \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial\mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin Z^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

As before, denote by $\mathcal{Y}^b$ the set of all distinct source blocks seen up to block b as defined in (2) in

Appendix A. Note that if $Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}$ for any $c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ$, then $Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) &\leq \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ} \ell(Z_c) \\ &\leq \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ} \ell(Z_c) \leq \ell(Y_b).$$

Substituting this into (13) yields

$$\sum_{c=1}^C I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \leq \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b) + \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c). \quad (14)$$

Consider then the second sum in (12) corresponding to old chunks. We can upper bound this sum as

$$\sum_{c=1}^C I_{\{Z_c \in \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \leq C \log |\mathcal{Z}^C|. \quad (15)$$

Substituting (14) and (15) into (12) and simplifying the resulting expression yields

$$R_{\text{VL}}(S) \leq 2 \log \ell(S) + 3 + 2C + \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b) + \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) + C \log |\mathcal{Z}^C|.$$

Taking expectations on both sides results in an upper bound on R_{VL} :

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{VL}} &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \log \ell(S) + 3 + 2\mathbb{E}(C) + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E}(I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c)\right) + \mathbb{E}(C \log |\mathcal{Z}^C|). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We now upper bound each of these expectations in turn.

The first expectation in (16) is upper bounded as

$$\mathbb{E} \log \ell(S) \leq \log \mathbb{E} \ell(S) = \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) \quad (17)$$

using Jensen's inequality.

For the second expectation in (16), observe that the number of chunks starting in source block Y_b is at most 1 plus the number of times the marker 0^M appears in Y_b alone (see again Fig. 2). Since the expectation of that latter number is upper bounded by $2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(C) = \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{C}_b| \leq B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)). \quad (18)$$

The third expectation in (16) is equal to

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E}(I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b)) = \mathbb{E}(L) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}), \quad (19)$$

where we have used the independence of $I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}}$ and $\ell(Y_b)$.

Consider next the fourth expectation

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \right) \leq \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} \ell(Z_c) \right)$$

in (16). Consider the boundary chunks arising at the boundary between Y_b and Y_{b+1} (see again Fig. 3). The total number of bits due to those chunks is upper bounded by the sum of two terms: The number of bits from the end of Y_b backwards until the end of the first (counting backwards) occurrence of 0^M (or $\ell(Y_b)$ if no such match exists in Y_b). Plus the number of bits from the start of Y_{b+1} forwards until the end of the first (counting forwards) occurrence of 10^M (or $\ell(Y_{b+1})$ if no such match exists in Y_{b+1}).

Note that a source symbol X_a is (by itself) a Bernoulli(1/2) process of random length. The expected value of the end of the first occurrence of 10^M in an infinite-length Bernoulli(1/2) process is 2^{M+1} by [30, Theorem 8.3]. The expected value of the end of the first occurrence of 0^M in an infinite-length Bernoulli(1/2) process is $2^{M+1} - 2$ by [30, Theorem 8.2]. Hence

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \right) \leq B2^{M+2}. \quad (20)$$

In this bound, the event that some source blocks may not contain a marker sequence is captured by the event that the match of the marker sequence in the infinite-length Bernoulli(1/2) process is beyond the length $\ell(Y_b)$ of the corresponding source block.

Consider then the last expectation

$$\mathbb{E}(C \log |\mathcal{Z}^C|)$$

in (16). We have

$$|\mathcal{Z}^C| \leq \ell(S) \leq 2B\mathbb{E}(L).$$

Using this, we can upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}(C \log |\mathcal{Z}^C|) \leq B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)), \quad (21)$$

where we have used (18).

Substituting (17)–(21) into (16) results in

$$\begin{aligned} R_{VL} &\leq 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + 3 + 2B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)) + \mathbb{E}(L) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\quad + B2^{M+2} + B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We next derive a lower bound on R^* . As before, we have

$$R^* \geq H(S). \quad (23)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} H(S) &= H(S, \ell(Y_1), \dots, \ell(Y_B)) - H(\ell(Y_1), \dots, \ell(Y_B) \mid S) \\ &\geq H(Y^B) - H(\ell(Y_1), \dots, \ell(Y_B)) \\ &\geq H(Y^B) - BH(L). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The term $BH(L)$ can be bounded as

$$BH(L) \leq B(1 + \log \mathbb{E}(L)) \quad (25)$$

using $1 \leq L \leq 2\mathbb{E}(L)$. The term $H(Y^B)$ can be bounded similarly to (5) in Appendix A as

$$H(Y^B) = \sum_{b=1}^B H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}) \quad (26)$$

with

$$H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}). \quad (27)$$

Conditioned on $Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$, Y^{b-1} , and L_b , the source block Y_b is uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^{L_b} \setminus \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) &\geq H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}, L_b) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\log|\{0, 1\}^{L_b} \setminus \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| | Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}(\log(2^{L_b} - |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|) | Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \log(2^{L_b} - A), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the independence of L_b and the event $Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$. Using the assumption that $A \leq 2^{\mathbb{E}(L_b)/2-1} \leq 2^{L_b-1}$, this last expression can be further lower bounded as

$$\mathbb{E} \log(2^{L_b} - A) \geq \mathbb{E}(L_b) - 1 = \mathbb{E}(L) - 1,$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})(\mathbb{E}(L) - 1). \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, by the same arguments as in (7) in Appendix A,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1})H(Y_b | Y^{b-1}, Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) &= A^{-1} \mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log |\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|) \\ &\geq A^{-1} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}|, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the last line follows from Jensen's inequality.

Combining (23)–(29) yields

$$R^* \geq (\mathbb{E}(L) - 1) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + A^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| \log \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}^{b-1}| - B(1 + \log \mathbb{E}(L)). \quad (30)$$

To obtain a more explicit expression, we can further lower bound R^* as

$$R^* \geq (0.5(\mathbb{E}(L) - 1) \min\{A, B\} + 0.5(B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - B(1 + \log \mathbb{E}(L)))^+, \quad (31)$$

similar to (9) in Appendix A.

From (22) and (30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_{VL} - R^* &\leq 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + 3 + B(4 + 2^{1-M}\mathbb{E}(L) + \log \mathbb{E}(L)) \\ &\quad + B2^{M+2} + B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(L)) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The two dominant terms in this last expression behave (to first order) like $2^M B$ and $2^{-M} B\mathbb{E}(L)$. Hence, the right-hand side of (32) is approximately minimized by choosing the marker length as

$$M \triangleq \lceil 0.5 \log \mathbb{E}(L) \rceil.$$

This splits each source block into an average of about $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}$ chunks of expected length about $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}$. With this choice of M , (32) yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_{VL} - R^* &\leq 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + 3 + B(4 + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)} + \log \mathbb{E}(L)) \\ &\quad + 8\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}B + B(1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)) \\ &\leq 2B(1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L)}) \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for B large enough. Combining this with (31) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} - 1 &\leq \frac{2B(1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})}) \log(B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}))}{(0.5(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) - 1) \min\{A, B\} + 0.5(B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - B(1 + \log \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})))^+} \\ &\leq \frac{5B(1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})}) \log(B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}))}{((\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) - 1) \min\{A, B\} + (B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - 2B \log(2\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})))^+}, \end{aligned}$$

again for B large enough. This proves the theorem. $\blacksquare$

APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF VARIABLE-LENGTH DEDUPLICATION FOR $B > A^2$ (EXAMPLE 5)

The bound (20) in Appendix C is appropriate when $B \leq A^2$. When $B > A^2$, it can be quite loose, since each pair $X_a X_{\bar{a}}$ yields at most three distinct boundary deduplication chunks. We next derive a tighter bound for the regime $B > A^2$.

Define the event $\mathcal{E}$ that at least one source symbol $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ does not contain the substring 10^M . Then, since each pair $X_a X_{\bar{a}}$ yields at most three distinct boundary deduplication chunks, we have on the complement of $\mathcal{E}$ that

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \leq A \sum_{a=1}^A (\ell(\text{head}(X_a)) + \ell(\text{tail}(X_a))),$$

where $\text{head}(X_a)$ is the string starting from the beginning of X_a up to and including the first occurrence of 10^M , and where $\text{tail}(X_a)$ is the string from the end of X_a backwards until the end of the first (counting backwards) occurrence of 0^M (see Fig. 3 in Appendix C). On $\mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \leq \ell(\mathbf{S}) \leq 2B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}).$$

Combining these last two inequalities yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \right) \leq A \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{E}(\ell(\text{head}(X_a)) + \ell(\text{tail}(X_a))) + 2B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}).$$

We have

$$A \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{E}(\ell(\text{head}(X_a)) + \ell(\text{tail}(X_a))) \leq 2^{M+2} A^2,$$

where we have again used [30, Theorems 8.2 and 8.3]. It remains to analyze $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. Since $L \geq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/2$ by assumption, the probability of the event $\mathcal{E}$ is upper bounded by that of the event that from A sequences drawn uniformly at random without replacement from $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/2}$ at least one of them contains no occurrence of 10^M . The probability of this last event is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) &\leq A(1 - 2^{-M-1})^{\lfloor \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/(2M+2) \rfloor} \\ &\leq A \exp(-2^{-M-1} \lfloor \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/(2M+2) \rfloor). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} I_{\{Z_c \notin \mathcal{Z}^{c-1}\}} \ell(Z_c) \right) \leq 2^{M+2} A^2 + 2AB\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) \exp(-2^{-M-1} \lfloor \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/(2M+2) \rfloor). \quad (33)$$

Substituting (17)–(19), (21), and (33) into (16) in Appendix C yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{VL}} &\leq 2\log(B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) + 3 + 2B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\quad + B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) + 2^{M+2}A^2 \\ &\quad + 2AB\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) \exp(-2^{-M-1}\lfloor \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/(2M+2) \rfloor). \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (30), this shows that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{VL}} - R^* &\leq 2\log(B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) + 3 + B(4 + 2^{1-M}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) + \log \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) \\ &\quad + B(1 + 2^{-M}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) \log(2B\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})) + 2^{M+2}A^2 \\ &\quad + 2AB\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) \exp(-2^{-M-1}\lfloor \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L})/(2M+2) \rfloor). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

For the remainder of the argument, we specialize to the setting in Example 5, namely $A = 2$, $B = 3L$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} = L) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} = L + 1) = 1/2$. With this, (34) becomes

$$R_{\text{VL}} - R^* \leq O\left(2^{-M}L^2 \log L + 2^M + L^2 \exp(-2^{-M-2}L/(M+1))\right).$$

Set the marker length to

$$M \triangleq \lfloor \log L - 2 \log \log L - 2 \rfloor,$$

which results in

$$R_{\text{VL}} - R^* \leq O(L \log^3 L). \quad (35)$$

Now, since there are only $A = 2$ source symbols of length L or $L + 1$, we can with high probability uniquely identify the source blocks $\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_B$ from $\mathbf{S}$ for L large enough. Hence, each source block $\mathbf{Y}_b$ adds asymptotically one bit of information to $\mathbf{S}$, i.e.,

$$R^* \geq H(\mathbf{S}) \geq (1 - o(1))B = (1 - o(1))3L$$

as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Combining this with (35) shows that

$$\frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \leq O(\log^3 L) = O(\log^3 B),$$

as claimed. ■

APPENDIX E ANALYSIS OF EXAMPLE 6

Recall that $A = \sqrt{B}$ and $\mathbf{L} = L = \sqrt{B}$. Following the same steps as those leading to (10) in Appendix B, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} R^* &\leq AL + B \log(A) + 1 \\ &= B + 0.5B \log(B) + 1 \\ &\leq O(B \log(B)) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

for the rate R^* of the optimal source code.

We continue with a lower bound on the rate R_{VL} of variable-length deduplication. For each chunk c , the flag indicating if the chunk is already in the dictionary takes one bit, resulting in a total of $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{C})$ bits. Further, each unique boundary chunk needs to be stored in the dictionary. We next argue that we will see on the order of $A^2 = B$ unique boundary chunks that each have length on the order of $\min\{2^M, L\}$. This will imply that storing the unique boundary chunks takes on the order of $\min\{2^M, L\}B$ bits.

Consider the two concatenations of source symbols $\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{X}_2$ and $\mathbf{X}_3\mathbf{X}_4$, and consider the two resulting boundary deduplication chunks (see Fig. 4). We can decompose the two boundary chunks as the




Fig. 4. Duplicate boundary deduplication chunks arising from the concatenation of different source symbols X_1X_2 and X_3X_4 . Compare to Fig. 2 in Appendix C.

concatenation $\text{tail}(X_1)\text{head}(X_2)$ and $\text{tail}(X_3)\text{head}(X_4)$, where $\text{tail}(\cdot)$ and $\text{head}(\cdot)$ denote the substring of the source symbol contributing to the boundary chunk (excluding the marker sequence, and truncated to length $L/2$ in case there is no marker sequence before then). From Fig. 4 we see that if $\text{tail}(X_1)\text{head}(X_2) = \text{tail}(X_3)\text{head}(X_4)$, then one of $\text{head}(X_2)$, $\text{head}(X_4)$ is a substring of the other, and one of $\text{tail}(X_1)$, $\text{tail}(X_3)$ is a substring of the other.

Consider a source symbol X_a , and assume $M \geq 10$ for now. With probability at least

$$1 - 2 \cdot 2^{M-5} \cdot 2^{-M} - 2 \cdot 2^{-M/2} \geq 1 - 2^{-3}$$

it has $\text{head}(X_a)$ of length at least $\min\{2^{M-5}, L/2\}$ containing a least one symbol 1 in the first $M/2$ bits and it has $\text{tail}(X_a)$ of length at least $\min\{2^{M-5}, L/2\}$ and containing a least one symbol 1 in the last $M/2$ bits. A short calculation shows that this implies that with probability at least $3/4$, the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ has at least $A/8$ symbols with this property.

Moreover, with probability at least $1 - (AL)^2 2^{-2^{M-5}}$ the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ has no repeating, nonoverlapping substrings of size 2^{M-5} . This argument is reported with more detail in Appendix F. In particular, if

$$M \geq 5 + \log \log(8(AL)^2) = 5 + \log \log(8B^2), \quad (37)$$

then with probability at least $3/4$ the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ has no repeating, nonoverlapping substrings of size $\min\{2^{M-5}, L/2\}$.

Combining the two arguments shows that with probability at least $1/2$ there are at least $A/8$ source symbols with both long, duplicate-free heads and tails. Further, each of these heads contains a symbol one within the first $M/2$ bits, and each of these tails contains a symbol one within its first $M/2$ bits. If this event holds, then $A^2/64 = B/64$ of all A^2 possible concatenations $X_aX_{\bar{a}}$ produce unique boundary chunks of length at least $\min\{2^{M-4}, L\}$.

Finally, since $B = A^2$, we will see at least $1/2$ of these possible unique boundary chunks in expectation. Therefore, the expected number of bits needed to store just the boundary chunks is at least $\Omega(\min\{2^M, L\}B) \geq \Omega(\min\{2^M, B^{1/2}\}B)$, assuming (37) is satisfied.

Combining these arguments, the rate R_{VL} of variable-length deduplication is lower bounded as

$$R_{\text{VL}} \geq \mathbb{E}(C) + I_{\{M \geq 5 + \log \log(8B^2)\}} \Omega(\min\{2^M, B^{1/2}\}B),$$

The expected number of chunks $\mathbb{E}(C)$ is lower bounded by $2^{-M}BL/M = 2^{-M}B^{3/2}/M$, so that

$$R_{\text{VL}} \geq 2^{-M}B^{3/2}/M + I_{\{M \geq 5 + \log \log(8B^2)\}} \Omega(\min\{2^M, B^{1/2}\}B/M).$$

This lower bound is minimized by

$$M \triangleq \frac{1}{4} \log(B) + O(1),$$

which results in the bound

$$R_{\text{VL}} \geq \Omega(B^{5/4} \log^{-1}(B)) \quad (38)$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

Combining (36) and (38) yields

$$\frac{R_{\text{VL}}}{R^*} \geq \Omega(B^{1/4} \log^{-2}(B))$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. ■

APPENDIX F

ANALYSIS OF MULTI-CHUNK DEDUPLICATION (PROOF OF THEOREM 3)

We start with an upper bound on the rate R_{MC} of multi-chunk deduplication. The initial encoding of the length $\ell(S)$ using a universal code for the integers takes again at most $2 \log \ell(S) + 3$ bits by [28, Lemma 13.5.1]. Consider then the encoding of chunk c . The flag indicating if the chunk is already in the dictionary takes one bit. If the chunk is new, then V_c is encoded using at most $2 \log(V_c) + 3$ bits, plus the V_c chunks starting at c are added to the dictionary using $\ell(Z_c Z_{c+1} \cdots Z_{c+V_c-1})$ bits. If the chunk is already in the dictionary, then W_c is encoded using at most $2 \log(W_c) + 3$ bits, plus a pointer into the dictionary using at most $\log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| + 1$ bits, where $\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}$ is again the dictionary when encoding chunk c . The next chunk to be encoded is either $c + V_c$ or $c + W_c$.




Fig. 5. Boundary chunks (indicated by underbraces) as defined by multi-chunk deduplication for marker length $M = 4$. The vertical line $|$ indicates the boundary between the source blocks Y_{b-1} and Y_b .

As before, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_b$ those chunks starting in source block Y_b . We again define the notion of boundary chunk indices $\partial \mathcal{C}_b$ and interior chunk indices $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ (see Appendix C), but this time with respect to the multi-chunk deduplication scheme, as shown in Fig. 5.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that there is at least one interior chunk of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_A$ that is either equal to another interior chunk in the source alphabet or to a boundary chunk of S . Assume we are on the complement of $\mathcal{E}$ for now, and consider the first interior chunk Z_c in Y_b (i.e., the smallest $c \in \mathcal{C}_b^\circ$). Then there are two possibilities, either $Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$ and all indices $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ correspond to new chunks, or $Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$ and all indices $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ correspond to chunks already in the dictionary.

In the former case ($Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$), the number V_c is larger than or equal to $|\mathcal{C}_b^\circ|$. The encoding of the chunks with indices in $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ takes thus at most

$$4 + 2 \log(V_c) + \ell(Z_c Z_{c+1} \cdots Z_{c+V_c-1})$$

bits. Since reducing the number of jointly encoded chunks and encoding them separately increases the aggregate rate, we can upper bound the total rate by assuming that $V_c = |\mathcal{C}_b^\circ|$. The encoding for the first interior chunk c in $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ takes in this case at most

$$4 + 2 \log|\mathcal{C}_b^\circ| + \ell(Y_b)$$

bits.

In the latter case ($Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}$), the number W_c is larger than or equal to $|\mathcal{C}_b^\circ|$ (since the corresponding chunks must have been seen in sequence by the uniqueness assumption), and all the chunks with indices in $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ are encoded together, taking at most

$$5 + 2 \log(W_c) + \log|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|$$

bits. Again, reducing the number of jointly encoded chunks and encoding them separately increases the aggregate rate, and thus we can upper bound the total rate by assuming that $W_c = |\mathcal{C}_b^\circ|$. The encoding for the first interior chunk c in $\mathcal{C}_b^\circ$ takes in this case at most

$$5 + 2 \log |\mathcal{C}_b^\circ| + \log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|$$

bits.

Assume next that we are on $\mathcal{E}$. If an interior chunk Z_c is not in the dictionary, it is encoded in the worst case using $4 + \ell(Z_c)$ bits. If an interior chunk Z_c is in the dictionary, then the pointer into the dictionary takes at most $1 + \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L))$ bits. In the worst case, each old chunk is encoded separately, leading to an additional 3 bits for the encoding of W_c . Thus, as long as

$$\log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)) \leq 2^{M-1} \quad (39)$$

the encoding of each old interior chunk Z_c takes at most

$$5 + \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)) \leq 5 + 2^{M-1} \leq 5 + \ell(Z_c)$$

bits, since each chunk has length at least 2^{M-1} by construction. Thus, on the complement of $\mathcal{E}$ and assuming (39) is satisfied, the encoding of the interior chunks of S takes at most

$$\sum_{c=1}^C (5 + \ell(Z_c)) \leq 6\ell(S) \leq 12B\mathbb{E}(L)$$

bits.

Similarly, as long as the condition (39) is satisfied, the boundary chunks can be encoded using at most $5 + \ell(Z_c)$ bits each, regardless of whether they are in the dictionary.

We can then upper bound the rate $R_{MC}(S)$ for a particular source sequence S as

$$\begin{aligned} R_{MC}(S) &\leq 2 \log \ell(S) + 3 + \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} (4 + 2 \log |\mathcal{C}_b^\circ| + \ell(Y_b)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \in \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} (5 + 2 \log |\mathcal{C}_b^\circ| + \log |\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}|) + \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} (5 + \ell(Z_c)) + I_{\mathcal{E}} 12B\mathbb{E}(L) \\ &\leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + B(8 + \log(B) + 3 \log \mathbb{E}(L)) + \sum_{b=1}^B I_{\{Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}\}} \ell(Y_b) \\ &\quad + \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} (5 + \ell(Z_c)) + I_{\mathcal{E}} 12B\mathbb{E}(L), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows after some algebra using the bounds $|\mathcal{C}_b^\circ| \leq 2\mathbb{E}(L)$, $|\mathcal{Z}^{c-1}| \leq 2B\mathbb{E}(L)$, and $\ell(S) \leq 2B\mathbb{E}(L)$. Taking expectations yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_{MC} &\leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + B(8 + \log(B) + 3 \log \mathbb{E}(L)) + \mathbb{E}(L) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} (5 + \ell(Z_c)) \right) + 12B\mathbb{E}(L)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

It remains to upper bound the last two terms in (40).

For the second-to-last term in (40), we have the upper bound

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial \mathcal{C}_b} (5 + \ell(Z_c)) \right) \leq \sum_{b=1}^B \left(5\mathbb{E}|\partial \mathcal{C}_b| + \mathbb{E}\ell(\text{head}(Y_b)) + \mathbb{E}\ell(\text{tail}(Y_b)) \right). \quad (41)$$

Here, $\text{head}(Y_b)$ are the bits from the start of Y_b forward until the end of the first (counting forwards) occurrence of the string $u10^M$ such that $u \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{M-1}-M-1}$ does not contain 0^M . And $\text{tail}(Y_b)$ are the bits from the end of Y_b backwards until the end of the first (counting backwards) occurrence of the string 0^M plus an additional $2^{M-1} - M$ bits. If no such substring occurs, head and tail denote all the bits in Y_b in either case.

The expected value of $\ell(\text{tail}(Y_b))$ is upper bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}\ell(\text{tail}(Y_b)) \leq 2^{M+1} - 2 + 2^{M-1} - M \leq 2^{M+2}$$

as before by [30, Theorem 8.2] (see again Appendix C). The quantity $\mathbb{E}\ell(\text{head}(Y_b))$ can be upper bounded by replacing Y_b with an infinite-length Bernoulli(1/2) process. The head of that Bernoulli process is then a concatenation of sub-chunks of the form $U_1 0^M U_2 0^M \dots U_N 0^M$ with $\ell(U_n) < 2^{M-1} - M$ for $n < N$ and with $\ell(U_N) \geq 2^{M-1} - M$. Consider the sequence of lengths $\ell(U_1), \ell(U_2), \dots$. This sequence forms an i.i.d. stochastic process, and N is a stopping time with respect to this process. Thus, we can apply Wald's equation together with [30, Theorem 8.2] to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\ell(\text{head}(Y_b)) \leq \mathbb{E}(N)2^{M+1}.$$

The random variable N is geometrically distributed with probability of success lower bounded by $1 - 2^{M-1} \cdot 2^{-M} = 1/2$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(N) \leq 2$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\ell(\text{head}(Y_b)) \leq 2^{M+2}.$$

The same argument also shows that

$$\mathbb{E}|\partial\mathcal{C}_b| \leq \mathbb{E}(N) + 1 \leq 3.$$

Substituting the last three equations into (41), we obtain

$$\sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{c \in \partial\mathcal{C}_b} (5 + \ell(Z_c)) \right) \leq B(15 + 2^{M+3}). \quad (42)$$

For the last term $12B\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ in (40), we need to upper bound the probability that there is at least one interior chunk in the source alphabet that is either equal to another interior chunk of the source alphabet or to a boundary chunk of the source sequence. Since all chunks have length at least 2^{M-1} by construction, whenever this last event holds, then $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_A$ contains a nonoverlapping duplicate substring of length 2^{M-2} (where the additional factor 1/2 accounts for the boundary chunks).

Consider a source symbol, say X_1 . The probability that it contains a nonoverlapping duplicate substring of length 2^{M-2} is upper bounded by the probability that a Bernoulli(1/2) process of length $2\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})$ contains such a substring. Consider next two source symbols, say X_1 and X_2 . Condition on their lengths $\ell(X_1)$ and $\ell(X_2)$. If these lengths are distinct, then X_1 and X_2 are independent Bernoulli(1/2) processes of given length. If the lengths are the same, then X_1 and X_2 are not independent, since they are chosen without replacement. However, the probability of X_1 containing a duplicate substring of length 2^{M-2} from X_2 is upper bounded by drawing them with replacement. Further, in both cases, the probability of the event under consideration is increased if we increase the length of the source symbols. In summary, the probability that the source alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ contains a nonoverlapping duplicate substring of length 2^{M-2} is upper bounded by the probability that A independent Bernoulli(1/2) processes of length $2\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})$ contain such a duplicate. This probability can in turn be upper bounded by $(2A\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}))^2 2^{-2^{M-2}}$. Therefore,

$$12B\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq 48A^2B\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})^3 2^{-2^{M-2}}. \quad (43)$$

Substituting (42) and (43) into (40) yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{MC}} &\leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})) + B(23 + \log(B) + 3 \log \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}) + 2^{M+3}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}) \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P}(Y_b \notin \mathcal{Y}^{b-1}) + 48A^2B\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L})^3 2^{-2^{M-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (30) in Appendix C, this shows that

$$R_{MC} - R^* \leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + B(25 + \log(B) + 4 \log \mathbb{E}(L) + 2^{M+3}) + 48A^2B\mathbb{E}(L)^3 2^{-2^{M-2}}. \quad (44)$$

Assume first that $A^4\mathbb{E}(L)^5 \geq 2B$, and set

$$M \triangleq \lceil \log \log(A^2\mathbb{E}(L)^3) + 2 \rceil.$$

Note that

$$2^{M-1} \geq \log(A^4\mathbb{E}(L)^6) \geq \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)),$$

satisfying (39). With this choice of M , (44) becomes after some simplification

$$R_{MC} - R^* \leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + B(73 + 128 \log(A) + \log(B) + 196 \log \mathbb{E}(L)). \quad (45)$$

Assume next that $A^4\mathbb{E}(L)^5 < 2B$, and set

$$M \triangleq \lceil \log \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)) + 1 \rceil.$$

Note that then

$$2^{M-1} \geq \log(2B\mathbb{E}(L)),$$

again satisfying (39). With this choice of M , (44) becomes after some simplification

$$R_{MC} - R^* \leq 5 + 2 \log(B\mathbb{E}(L)) + B(105 + 33 \log(B) + 36 \log \mathbb{E}(L)). \quad (46)$$

From (45) and (46), we conclude that, regardless of the relationship of A , B , and $\mathbb{E}(L)$, we have

$$R_{MC} - R^* \leq O(B \log(AB\mathbb{E}(L)))$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. Together with (31) in Appendix C, we obtain

$$\frac{R_{MC}}{R^*} - 1 \leq O\left(\frac{B \log(AB\mathbb{E}(L))}{((\mathbb{E}(L) - 1) \min\{A, B\} + (B - A)^+ \log(A/2) - 2B \log(2\mathbb{E}(L)))^+}\right) \quad (47)$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$. ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks M. A. Maddah-Ali for helpful initial discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Deutsch, “DEFLATE compressed data format specification,” RFC 1951, May 1996.
- [2] J. Ziv and A. Lempel, “A universal algorithm for sequential data compression,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 23, pp. 337–343, May 1977.
- [3] J. G. Cleary and I. H. Witten, “Data compression using adaptive coding and partial string matching,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 32, pp. 396–402, Apr. 1984.
- [4] I. H. Witten and T. C. Bell, “The zero frequency problem: Estimating the probabilities of novel events in adaptive text compression,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 37, pp. 1085–1094, July 1991.
- [5] A. El-Shimi, R. Kalach, A. Kumar, A. Oltean, J. Li, and S. Sengupta, “Primary data deduplication-large scale study and system design,” in *Proc. USENIX ATC*, pp. 1–12, June 2012.
- [6] I. Drago, M. Mellia, M. M. Munafò, A. Sperotto, R. Sadre, and A. Pras, “Inside Dropbox: Understanding personal cloud storage services,” in *Proc. ACM IMC*, pp. 481–494, Nov. 2012.
- [7] U. Manber, “Finding similar files in a large file system,” in *Proc. USENIX TC*, pp. 1–10, Jan. 1994.
- [8] A. Muthitacharoen, B. Chen, and D. Mazières, “A low-bandwidth network file system,” in *Proc. ACM SOSP*, pp. 174–187, Oct. 2001.
- [9] S. Quinlan and S. Dorward, “Venti: A new approach to archival data storage,” in *Proc. USENIX FAST*, pp. 89–102, Jan. 2002.
- [10] L. L. You, K. T. Pollack, and D. D. E. Long, “Deep store: An archival storage system architecture,” in *Proc. IEEE ICDE*, pp. 804–815, Apr. 2005.
- [11] L. P. Cox, C. D. Murray, and B. D. Noble, “Pastiche: Making backup cheap and easy,” in *Proc. USENIX OSDI*, pp. 285–298, Dec. 2002.
- [12] B. Zhu, K. Li, and H. Patterson, “Avoiding the disk bottleneck in the data domain deduplication file system,” in *Proc. USENIX FAST*, pp. 269–282, Feb. 2008.

- [13] D. Bhagwat, K. Eshghi, D. D. E. Long, and M. Lillibridge, "Extreme binning: Scalable, parallel deduplication for chunk-based file backup," in *Proc. IEEE MASCOTS*, pp. 1–9, Sept. 2009.
- [14] C. Policoniadis and I. Pratt, "Alternatives for detecting redundancy in storage systems data," in *Proc. USENIX ATC*, pp. 73–86, June 2004.
- [15] C. P. Sapuntzakis, R. Chandra, B. Pfaff, J. Chow, M. S. Lam, and M. Rosenblum, "Optimizing the migration of virtual computers," in *Proc. USENIX OSDI*, pp. 377–390, Dec. 2002.
- [16] K. Jin and E. L. Miller, "The effectiveness of deduplication on virtual machine disk images," in *Proc. ACM SYSTOR*, pp. 1–12, May 2009.
- [17] A. Orlitsky, N. P. Santhanam, and J. Zhang, "Universal compression of memoryless sources over unknown alphabets," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 1469–1481, July 2004.
- [18] Y. M. Shtarkov, T. J. Tjalkens, and F. M. J. Willems, "Multi-alphabet universal coding of memoryless sources," *Problems Inform. Transm.*, vol. 31, pp. 114–127, Apr. 1995.
- [19] J. Aberg, Y. M. Shtarkov, and B. J. Smeets, "Multialphabet coding with separate alphabet description," in *Proc. IEEE SEQUENCES*, pp. 56–65, June 1997.
- [20] A. Orlitsky, "Interactive communication of balanced distributions and correlated files," *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, vol. 6, pp. 548–564, Nov. 1993.
- [21] A. Orlitsky and K. Vishwanath, "Practical protocols for interactive communication," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, p. 115, June 2001.
- [22] R. Venkataramanan, H. Zhang, and K. Ramchandran, "Interactive low-complexity codes for synchronization from deletions and insertions," in *Proc. Allerton Conf.*, pp. 1412–1419, Sept. 2010.
- [23] N. Ma, K. Ramchandran, and D. Tse, "Efficient file synchronization: A distributed source coding approach," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, pp. 583–587, July 2011.
- [24] S. M. S. T. Yazdi and L. Dolecek, "A deterministic polynomial-time protocol for synchronization from deletions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, pp. 397–409, Jan. 2014.
- [25] S. E. Rouayheb, S. Goparaju, H. M. Kiah, and O. Milenkovic, "Synchronizing edits in distributed storage networks," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, pp. 1472–1476, June 2015.
- [26] Q. Wang, V. Cadambe, S. Jaggi, M. Schwartz, and M. Médard, "File updates under random/arbitrary insertions and deletions," in *Proc. IEEE ITW*, pp. 1–5, Oct. 2015.
- [27] P. Elias, "Universal codeword sets and representations of the integers," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 21, pp. 194–203, Mar. 1975.
- [28] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, second ed., 2006.
- [29] J. H. van Lint and R. M. Wilson, *A Course in Combinatorics*. Cambridge, second ed., 2001.
- [30] R. Sedgewick and P. Flajolet, *An Introduction to the Analysis of Algorithms*. Addison Wesley, second ed., 2013.